



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent Application of)	MAIL STOP AMENDMENT
Derek Geoffrey Finch et al.)	
Application No.: 10/541,906)	Group Art Unit: 3662
Filed: July 12, 2005)	Examiner: Hien Le
For: IMPROVEMENTS RELATING TO)	Confirmation No.: 6242
VELOCITY EXTRACTION)	
)	
)	
)	
)	

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

This communication is a full and timely response to the non-final Office Action dated August 20, 2007. Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested. Claims 17-28 and 33-36 remain pending, where claims 1-16 and 29-32 were previously cancelled.

Applicants claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §§102 and 103 for an alleged lack of novelty over various applied art. For example, in numbered paragraph 2, on page 2 of the Office Action, claims 17, 19, and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by *Carrara* (U.S. Patent No. 4,972,194); in numbered paragraph 2 on page 3 of the Office Action, claims 17, 19, 20-26, 28, and 33-35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for alleged unpatentability over the *Carrara* patent in view of *Togashi* (U.S. Patent No. 4,809,002). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

As discussed previously, Applicants' exemplary Figures 1-9 illustrate an embodiment in which a coherent burst is emitted from a radar antenna and reflected